

REMARKS

I. 101 Rejection

Claims 1-16 were rejected under section 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter as related to a “graphical user interface.” Independent claim 1 has been amended to call for a computer storage medium, which is tangible. In addition, the dependent claims from claim 1 have also been amended to refer to the computer storage medium. Accordingly, the applicant believes that the section 101 rejection has been addressed and should be withdrawn.

II. 102 rejection

Claims 1,2, 5-8 and 10-11 were rejected under 102(e) as being anticipated by Peterson (2003/0028610). Independent claims 1 and claim 15 and 17 have been amended to add claims 13 and 14 to all the independent claims. All the independent claims now call for:

displaying a **selectable indicator** for visually presenting a group list to the first user, the group list including an **indication field of a role** for each of the members in the list wherein the list of group members includes **indicia concerning connection by each group members to the network**.

Peterson was not cited against claim 13 or 14 which makes sense as Peterson does not disclose displaying selectable indicators of the groups to which the user belongs. Claim 13 was rejected using the combination of Pearson un view of Markki. Specifically, paragraph 0073 and 00192 of Markki was cited against claim 13. Claim 14 was rejected using the combination of Pearson un view of Markki. Specifically, paragraph 0073 of Markki was cited against claim 14.

INDICATION FIELD OF A ROLE

Paragraph 0073 of Markki discloses that a list of the groups of which a user is a member may be presented by a node for search purposes. Paragraph 0192

discloses that a group manager, a member, and/or a member with a specific role in a group might create group specific practices, metadata sets or schemas. There is no disclosure of the claimed element of **displaying** a group list including “a role for each of the members in the list.” Roles are important in collaboration applications. In collaboration applications, one node needs to be the lead and the other nodes usually follow. This element is not insignificant because being able to identify the roles is an important part of being on a collaboration application. This element is missing from the combination applied to claim 13 and now that claim 13 has been added to the independent claims,

MEMBERS OF THE NETWORK

In addition, there is no disclosure of the displayed list including “indicia concerning connection by each group member to the network.” Markki at 0073 discloses displaying a list of the groups to which the user belongs. There is no disclosure of displaying an indicia to represent the members of the collaboration application. Again, this distinction is material. One of the desires of collaboration applications is to allow collaboration. Knowing that all member of the group are attached to the collaboration application in the group space is important is a truly collaborative effort is to occur.

In addition, paragraph 0073 of Markki points to steps 203 and 205 of Fig. 2. Step 203 states “User specifies group(s)” and step 205 states “User indicates metadata and/or other parameters.” Again, there is no disclosure of the claim elements of indicating roles of participant or indicating who are members of what groups.

In conclusion, two elements that were previously in claim 14 (indicating roles of participant or indicating who are members of what groups) are missing from the cited references. These elements are not insignificant, but elements that make the claimed application a patentable improvement over the cited references. According to the claims, a user can now see the roles of the various people using the collaboration application. As such, the collaboration will be more orderly by

knowing the various role of the parties. In addition, by displaying the members of the group, collaboration will be improved. Questions can be directed to specific individuals and people with specific roles. The end result is that collaboration will be improved over the systems in the cited art.

III. Rejections under 103

A. Claims 3, 4, 9, 12-14 and 17-20

Claims 3, 4, 9, 12-14 and 17-20 were rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pearson in view of Markki et al (2004/0243672). Pearson fails to disclose a peer to peer network and Markki is used to add the peer to peer network element.

As the independent claims (1, 15 and 17) were amended to include claim 14 and the elements of claim 14 are not disclosed in the cited references, all the dependent claims have elements that are not disclosed in the cited references. Accordingly, all the dependent claims are allowable and the rejection under section 103 should be withdrawn.

B. Claims 15 and 16

Claims 15-16 were rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pearson in view of Zaner (2004/0041836). Pearson fails to disclose a graphical user interface for facilitating an online group interaction over a computer network and Zaner is used to supply this missing element.\

As the independent claims (1, 15 and 17) were amended to include claim 14 and the elements of claim 14 are not disclosed in the cited references, all the dependent claims have elements that are not disclosed in the cited references. Accordingly, all the dependent claims are allowable and the rejection under section 103 should be withdrawn.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: June 10, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By___/W. J. Kramer #46,229/_____

William J. Kramer

Registration No.: 46,229

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300

Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357

(312) 474-6300

Attorney for Applicant